## REMARKS

Claims 1 – 3 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbano (U.S. Pat. No.: 4,481,887) in view of Fufido et al. (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,720,874). Specifically, the Examiner stated:

> In regard to claims 1 – 3, 6: Urbano discloses the claimed invention [in] Fig. 1, security doors 1 having first pair of panels (doors) 3 for separating an unsecured area from a walkway 5 from an open position to a blocked position after a person has passed therethrough; column 3, lines 60-64, having electronic eye or photocell 13, 13' to detect the person and having a second pair of panels (doors) 3 separating the walkway 5 from a secured area from an open position to a blocked position after the person has passed therethrough. Urbano does not disclose the method of identifying the person in [the] unsecured area and while the person [is] in the walkway. Fufido teaches [in] Fig. 1, column 5, line 48-56, having various sensors and [a] camera 22 for identify[ing] the person 15 in unsecured area 18. It would have been obvious steps method [sic] of providing [a] camera in [the] unsecured area or walkway in order to identify the person and move the person from [the] unsecured area or walkway to [the] secure area by passing through the security door.

It is respectfully submitted that the Office has misconstrued the teachings of Urbano and Fufido. It is believed that combination of Urbano and Fufido fails to teach the invention as claimed. More specifically, it is respectfully submitted that Urbano teaches a security system having outer and inner doors that are normally in the closed position. Operation of the security system begins when a user approaches the outer doors. A photocell 13, 13' senses the user's approach and activates a motor control unit 18 which opens the outer doors, thus allowing the user to enter a vestibule (column 4, lines 31 – 36). The outer doors are automatically closed after the user enters the vestibule (column 4, lines 36 – 37). Closure of the outer doors triggers a time delay relay 26 within a control circuit (column 4, lines 37 – 39). The time delay relay 26 establishes a predetermined time delay. After the predetermined time delay has elapsed, a second motor control unit 21 is activated and the inner doors are opened allowing the user to exit the vestibule (column 4, lines 39 – 43).

It is respectfully submitted that the method of operation disclosed by Urbano creates a bottleneck and hinders the flow of traffic. First, a user must wait for the outer doors to open before entering the vestibule (the outer doors are only opened after the photocell sensor is triggered by the user). After the user enters the vestibule, the user must wait for the outer doors to close to activate the time delay relay. The user must further wait for the predetermined time period to elapse before the inner doors are activated. Finally, the user must wait for the inner doors to travel to their open position before the user can exit the vestibule.

In contrast, the method of the claimed invention relates to a system that has inner and outer panels/doors that are normally in the open position. Accordingly, a person is able to walk directly onto the walkway separating the unsecured area from the secured area without having to stop and wait for the first set of panels/doors to open. The first pair of panels/doors are moved to a blocked position only after the person passes onto the walkway. More specifically, claims 1 and 6 recite "moving a first pair of panels (doors) separating an unsecured area from a walkway from an open position to a blocked position after a person has passed therethrough."

While on the walkway, the person is identified as being either approved or not approved. More specifically, claims 1 and 6 recite "identifying said person as approved." If the person is identified as approved, the person can continue directly into the secured area without ever having to stop on the walkway. Claims 1 and 6 recite "moving a second pair of panels (doors) separating said walkway from a secured area from an open position to a blocked position after said person has passed therethrough." The second pair of panels/doors are moved to a blocked position only after the person exits the walkway and passes into the secured area; the movement of the second pair of panels/doors is independent of the closing of the first set of panels/doors.

The claimed invention eliminates several waiting periods, reduces bottlenecks, and increases the amount of traffic flow. More specifically, a user does not have to wait for the first set of panels/doors to open (e.g., after triggering a photocell), does not have to wait for the first set of panels/doors to close to activate a time delay relay, does not have to wait for a predetermined time period to elapse, and/or does not have to wait for the second set of panels/doors to open before exiting the walkway.

Additionally, it is respectfully submitted that Fufido fails to provide teachings that would eliminate the waiting periods inherent to Urbano. In contrast, Fufido is directed to a portal access control system having a single locked door and several sensors. The door and sensors are used together to prevent unauthorized entry from a public area into a secured area. The sensors are used to authenticate individuals attempting to enter the secured area and to trigger alarms should and unauthorized person pass from the public area into the secured area either by tailgating behind an authorized user or by passing around an authorized user who is traveling in the opposite direction (i.e., from the secured area into the public area).

Thus, for the reasons discussed above, it is believed that claims 1 and 6 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 1 and 6 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 2 – 3 depend from allowable base claim 1. Thus for the reasons discussed above in conjunction with claim 1, it is believed that claims 2 – 3 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 2 – 3 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

Claims 4 – 5 and 7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Urbano (U.S. Pat. No.: 4,481,887) in view of Fufido et al. (U.S. Pat. No.: 6,720,874) and in further view of Tonali (U.S. Patent No.: 4,656,954). Specifically, the Examiner stated:

> In regard to claims 4, 7: Urbano discloses the claimed invention [in] Fig. 1, security doors 1 having first pair of panels (doors) 3 for separating an unsecured area from a walkway 5 from an open position to a blocked position after a person has passed therethrough; column 3, lines 60-64, having electronic eye or photocell 13, 13' to detect the person and having a second pair of panels (doors) 3 separating the walkway 5 from a secured area from an open position to a blocked position after the person has passed therethrough. Urbano does not disclose the method of identifying the person as not approved and controlling traffic by moving a side panel separating a second unsecured area from the walkway. Fufido teaches [at] Fig. 1, column 5, line 48-56, having various sensors and [a] camera 22 for identify[ing] the person 15 in unsecured area 18. Tonali teaches [in] Fig. 1 having a side panel (door) 10 separating the second unsecured area D from the walkway from an open position to a blocked position after the person has passed therethrough. It would have been obvious steps method [sic] of providing [a] camera in order to identify the person and it is obvious steps method [sic] by providing side panel in order to move unapproved person from walkway to unsecured area.

Additionally, the Examiner stated:

> In regard to claim 5: Urbano discloses the claimed invention [in] Fig. 1, security doors 1 having first pair of panels (doors) 3 for separating an unsecured area from a walkway 5 from an open position to a blocked position after a person has passed therethrough; column 3, lines 60-64, having electronic eye or photocell 13, 13' to detect the person and having a second pair of panels (doors) 3 separating the walkway 5 from a secured area from an open position to a blocked position after the person has passed therethrough. Urbano does not disclose the method [of] identifying the person an [sic] not approved and controlling traffic by providing [a] side panel separating a second unsecured area from the walkway and trapping the person within the panels. Fufido teaches [at] Fig. 1, column 5, line 48-56, having various sensors and [a] camera 22 for identify[ing] the person 15 in unsecured area 18. Tonali teaches [at] Fig. 1, column 3, line 3 – 37, having a side panel (door) 10 separating the second unsecured area D from the walkway from an open position to a blocked position thereby holding the person within the panels and unlocked the door 10 to move the users into discharge space D. It would have been obvious steps method [sic] of providing [a] camera in order to identify the person and it is obvious steps method [sic] by providing side panel in order to move the unauthorized person from walkway to unsecured area.

Claims 4, 5, and 7 recite "identifying said person as not approved" and "moving a second pair of panels (doors) separating said walkway from a secured area from an open position to a blocked position before said person can pass therethrough." Urbano and Fufido fail to teach or disclose a method in which the second set of panels/doors, originally in the open position, are moved to a blocked position only after a person is identified as not approved. Furthermore as discussed above in conjunction with claims 1 and 6, Urbano and Fufido fail to teach or suggest that the movement of the second set of panels/doors are independent of the closing of the first set of panels/doors. It is respectfully submitted that the Office has failed to demonstrate that Tonali provides these missing teachings.

Furthermore, claims 4 and 7 recite "moving a side panel (door) separating said second unsecured area from said walkway from an open position to a blocked position after said person has passed therethrough," whereas claim 5 recites "moving a side panel separating a second unsecured area from said walkway from an open position to a blocked position thereby trapping said person within said panels."

It is respectfully submitted that Urbano and Fufido fail to teach or disclose a system or method which utilizes a side panel/door. It is further submitted that Tonali fails to teach or disclose a method in which the side panel/door is originally in the open position. In contrast, Tonali teaches that the side door (i.e., door 10) is initially locked (column 3, lines 10 – 12) and remains locked unless the detector senses the presence of weapons or other metal objects (column 3, lines 24 – 31).

Thus, for these reasons, it is believed that claims 4 – 5 and 7 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, it is respectfully requested that the rejection of claims 4 – 5 and 7 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

New claims 8 and 9 are added. Claims 8 and 9 depend from allowable claims 1 and 6, respectively. No new matter has been added.

Applicants have made a diligent effort to place the claims in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for claims 1 – 9 is respectfully requested. If the Examiner is of the opinion that the instant application is in condition for disposition other than through allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact applicants' attorney at the telephone number listed below so that additional changes may be discussed.

Respectfully submitted,

Richard J. Coldren

Richard J. Coldren
Reg. No. 44,084
Thorp Reed & Armstrong LLP
One Oxford Centre
301 Grant Street, 14th Floor
Pittsburgh, PA 15219-1425
(412) 394-2442

Dated: 17 August 2004

Attorneys for Applicant